

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**CHUKWUMA E. AZUBUKO,  
Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No. 2:05-CV-363  
JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.**

**CITY OF BOSTON – PARKING CLERK,  
Defendant.**

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Chukwuma E. Azubuko's motion reconsideration. Doc. 25. Plaintiff specifically seeks reconsideration of the Court's December 17, 2013 Order, doc. 24, denying Plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment, doc. 23.

The Court has authority, both under common law and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to reconsider interlocutory orders before the entry of final judgment. *See In re Life Investors Ins. Co. of Am.*, 589 F.3d 319, 326 n.6 (6th Cir. 2009) (“[A] district court may always reconsider and revise its interlocutory orders while it retains jurisdiction over the case.”). “Traditionally, courts will find justification for reconsidering interlocutory orders when there is (1) an intervening change of controlling law; (2) new evidence available; or (3) a need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” *Rodriguez v. Tenn. Laborers Health & Welfare Fund*, 89 F. App'x 949, 959 (6th Cir. 2004); *see also Tenn. Protection & Advocacy, Inc. v. Wells*, 371 F.3d 342, 348 (6th Cir. 2004) (defining manifest injustice as “[a]n error in the trial court that is direct, obvious, and observable”).

